R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

In one embodiment, the presently claimed invention provides an apparatus comprising an input section and an output section. The input section may be configured to generate a first control signal and a second control signal in response to an input signal and a select signal. The output section may be configured to generate an output signal in response to the first and the second control signals. The input section generally comprises a first device and a second device. The first and the second devices each have a source and a drain configured to connect the input signal with the first control signal and the second control signal in response to the select signal. The output signal is generally (i) related to the input signal when in a first mode and (ii) disabled when in a second mode. One or more third devices each having a source and a drain may be configured to connect the first control signal and the second control signal when in the first mode.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mueller et al. '663 (hereinafter Mueller) is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Mueller is directed to full swing voltage input / full swing voltage output bi-directional repeaters for high resistance or high capacitance bi-directional signal lines and methods therefor (Title).

In contrast, the present invention (claim 1) provides an input section configured to generate a first control signal and a second control signal in response to an input signal and a select signal. The input section comprises a first device and a second device each having a source and a drain configured to connect the input signal with the first control signal and second control signal in response to the select signal. One or more third devices each have a source and a drain configured to connect the first control signal and the second control signals when in a first mode. Claims 15 and 16 include similar recitations. Mueller does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention, arranged as in the present claims. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over Hanson and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Specifically, assuming, *arguendo*, the devices 708 and 710 in FIG. 7 of Mueller are similar to the presently claimed first and second devices and the device 608 in FIG. 6 of Mueller is similar to the presently claimed one or more third devices (as suggested on pages 2-3, paragraph no. 4 of the Office Action and for which Applicants' representative does not necessarily agree), Mueller

does not disclose or suggest an apparatus comprising both (i) **a first device and a second device each having a source and a drain configured to connect the input signal with the first control signal and the second control signal in response to the select signal AND** (ii) **one or more third devices each have a source and a drain configured to connect the first control signal and the second control signal when in the first mode**, as presently claimed. In particular, contrary to the position taken in the Office Action that FIGS. 6 and 7 disclose **an apparatus** (see the last three lines on page 2 of the Office Action), Mueller states:

> FIGS. 5-7 illustrate, in accordance with **various embodiments** of the present invention, **various alternative configurations** of a full swing voltage bi-directional tri-state buffer circuit .... (column 4, lines 29-33 of Mueller).

Specifically, with respect to FIG. 6, Mueller states:

> FIG. 6 illustrates, in greater detail and in accordance with yet another embodiment of the present invention, a bi-direction full swing voltage repeater circuit 600. . . . **In this particular implementation, the input stage 602A includes a transmission gate 608** that can pass the voltages received from node 408 responsive to enable control signal EN_RD and its complement EN_RDc (column 8, lines 6-13 of Mueller, emphasis added).

With respect to FIG. 7, Mueller provides:

> In FIG. 7, the control stage 704A of the uni-directional repeater circuit 700A includes two transmission gates 708 and 710 that are implemented between nodes 712 and 714. Transmission gates 718 [sic] and 710 can pass voltages between nodes 712 and 714, responsive to control signal EN_RD and its complement. **In this particular embodiment, the input stage 702A is implemented by an inverter 718** that inverts the input values at node 408 and outputs the

inverted values to control stage 704A (column 9, lines 5-13 0f Mueller, emphasis added).

Because FIGS. 6 and 7 of Mueller are **alternative** embodiments, Mueller does not disclose or suggest the devices 708, 710 and 608 implemented as part of the same apparatus. Thus, Mueller does not disclose or suggest an apparatus comprising **both** (a) an input section comprising a first device and a second device each having a source and a drain configured to connect the input signal to the first control signal and the second control signal in response to the select signal **AND** (b) one or more third devices each having a source and a drain configured to connect the first control signal and the second control signal when in a first mode, as presently claimed. Therefore, Mueller does not disclose each and every element of the presently claimed invention, **arranged as in the present claims**. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not appear to present a proper rejection with respect to claims 2-14 and 17-21. Specifically, MPEP §707.07(d) provides "where a claim is refused for any reason relating to the merits thereof it should be 'rejected' and the ground of rejection fully and clearly stated ...." MPEP §707.07(d) further provides that "an omnibus rejection of the claim 'on the references and for the reasons of record' is stereotyped and usually not informative and should therefore be

avoided." The statements on page 3, lines 9-13 of the Office Action that with regard to claims 2-14 and 17-21 "the reference also meets all the claimed limitations in these claims" appear to be the type of omnibus rejections that are to be avoided because they are not informative as to why the reference is considered to meet the claimed limitations. As such, the rejections of claims 2-14 and 17-21 do not fully and clearly state the grounds of the rejections as required by MPEP §707.07(d). As such, the Office Action does not appear to have put forth a proper *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 2-14 and 17-21. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claims 2-14 and 17-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 16 which are believed to be allowable. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.

Robert M. Miller
Registration No. 42,892
24025 Greater Mack, Suite 200
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
(586) 498-0670

Dated: August 1, 2003

Docket No.: 0325.00502